



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

8W

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/551,973 04/14/00 WESTFIELD

B 830053.410

000500 IM52/1105  
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLL  
701 FIFTH AVE  
SUITE 6300  
SEATTLE WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

RECKER, P  
ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1761  
DATE MAILED:

8  
11/05/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/551,973	WESTFIELD, BARBARA
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Drew E Becker	1761

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

**A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.**

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 September 2001.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Kelsey [Pat. No. 519,580].

Kelsey teaches a device comprising a frame with two opposing sidewalls coupled to a base member (Figure 1, b-c), a plurality of removable, perforated trays (Figure 1, g), and a handle (Figure 1, d). Phrases such as "for an automatic bread making machine" are merely intended methods of using the claimed apparatus and as such are not given patentable weight.

3. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chadwick et al [Pat. No. 2,671,004].

Chadwick et al teaches a device comprising a frame with two opposing sidewalls coupled to a base member (Figure 1, #5 & 10), a plurality of removable, perforated trays (Figure 1, 25), a housing with a baking chamber which inherently included a heat source (Figure 1, 1), and a handle (Figure 2).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 11-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barradas [Pat. No. 5,445,061] in view of Kelsey.

Barradas teaches a device and method for making bread comprising a baking chamber (Figure 5, 12), a frame with a base member coupled to a bottom region of the baking chamber (Figure 5, #48, 54, 56), vertically spaced removable trays (Figure 4, #48; Figure 5, #58, 60, 62), a source of heat (column 2, line 45), a container for bread making ingredients (Figure 2, 24), a mixing motor (Figure 2, 14), and mixing the ingredients in the container to form a dough, dividing the dough into portions, and placing the portions into trays (column 2, lines 57-70). Barradas does not teach a frame with two sidewalls which hold removable trays. Kelsey teaches a cooking method and device comprising a frame with two opposing sidewalls coupled to a base member (Figure 1, b-c), a plurality of removable, perforated trays (Figure 1, g), and a handle (Figure 1, d). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the rack assembly of Kelsey into the invention of Barradas since both are directed to cooking devices, since Barradas already includes a removable rack system with trays, since the rack structure of Kelsey was sized to fit within a pot (Figure 1) and the baking chamber of Barradas was sized to accept a pot-sized rack structure (Figure 1), and

since the rack structure of Kelsey would connect the trays into one unitary structure and permit one-step insertion and removal of the trays.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

---

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Drew E Becker whose telephone number is 703-305-0300. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on 703-308-3959. The fax phone numbers for

Application/Control Number: 09/551,973  
Art Unit: 1761

Page 5

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3602 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1495.

Drew Becker  
October 25, 2001

  
KEITH HENDRICKS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER